

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of:
Cragun et al.

Serial No.: 10/691,287

Filed: 10/22/03

For: ATTACHING AND DISPLAYING
ANNOTATIONS TO
CHANGING DATA VIEWS

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Confirmation No.: 2240

Group Art Unit: 2165

Examiner: Tomasz Ponikiewski

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to fax number 571-273-8300 to the attention of Examiner Tomasz Ponikiewski, on the date shown below:

March 7, 2007 /Esther Marques/
Date Esther Marques

Dear Sir:

APPEAL BRIEF

Applicants submit this Appeal Brief to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on appeal from the decision of the Examiner of Group Art Unit 2165 dated September 12, 2006, finally rejecting claims 9-24, 26, 27 and 29-31. The final rejection of claims 9-24, 26, 27 and 29-31 is appealed. This Appeal Brief is believed to be timely since it is electronically transmitted by the extended due date of March 11, 2007, as set by the filing of a Notice of Appeal on December 11, 2006. Please charge the fee of \$500.00 for filing this brief to Deposit Account No. 09-0465/ROC920030187US1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Identification Page.....	1
2.	Table of Contents	2
3.	Real Party in Interest	3
4.	Related Appeals and Interferences	4
5.	Status of Claims	5
6.	Status of Amendments	6
7.	Summary of Claimed Subject Matter	7
8.	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal	10
9.	Arguments	11
10.	Conclusion	19
11.	Claims Appendix	20
12.	Evidence Appendix	25
13.	Related Proceedings Appendix	26

Real Party in Interest

The present application has been assigned to International Business Machines Corporation, Armonk, New York.

Related Appeals and Interferences

Applicants assert that no other appeals or interferences are known to the Applicants, the Applicants' legal representative, or assignee which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

Status of Claims

Claims 9-24, 26, 27 and 29-31 are pending in the application. Claims 1-31 were originally presented in the application. Claims 1-8, 25 and 28 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 9-24, 26, 27 and 29-31 stand finally rejected as discussed below. The final rejections of claims 9-24, 26, 27, and 29-31 are appealed. The pending claims are shown in the attached Claims Appendix.

Status of Amendments

All claim amendments prior to the Final office Action have been entered by the Examiner. Proposed amendments to the claims after the final rejection were not entered.

Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

A. CLAIM 9 – INDEPENDENT

Claim 9 recites a computer implemented method for providing an indication of an annotation to a portion of a first view of data. *See Application* Abstract and paragraph [0020]. As claimed, the method includes providing an interface allowing display of a second view of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0026], [0036] – [0037], and [0044], and element 400 of figure 4C. The method further includes analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0042] – [0043], element 310 of figure 3, and elements 504 and 510 of figure 5. The method further includes providing an indication of the annotation in the interface, only if a predetermined set of sub-objects visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0044] – [0045], element 312 of figure 3, element 400 of Figures 4C and D, and element 514 of figure 5.

B. CLAIM 17 – INDEPENDENT

Claim 17 recites a computer implemented method of creating and displaying an annotation associated with an annotated portion of a first view of data. *See Application* Abstract, paragraphs [0023] and [0030], and element 110 of figure 1. As claimed, the method includes providing an interface allowing selection of the annotated portion of the first view of data and creation of the annotation, wherein the annotated portion comprises at least two cells visible in the first view of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0037] – [0038], and elements 302 and 304 of figure 3. The method further includes creating a record containing the annotation and a link to each cell in the annotated portion. *See Application* paragraph [0040] and element 306 of figure 3. The method further includes presenting a second view of data. *See Application* paragraph [0042] and element 308 of figure 3. The method further includes analyzing the second view of data to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0042] – [0043], element 310 of figure 3, and elements 504 and 510 of figure 5. The method further includes

providing an indication of the annotation, only if a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the referenced portion of the first view of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0044] – [0045], element 312 of figure 3, element 400 of Figures 4C and D, and element 514 of figure 5.

C. CLAIM 24 – INDEPENDENT

Claim 24 recites a tangible computer-readable storage medium containing a program for associating an annotation with an annotated portion of a first view of data. *See Application* Abstract, paragraphs [0023] and [0029], and element 110 of figure 1. When executed by a processor as claimed, the program performs operations which include providing an interface allowing a user to select the annotated portion and to create the annotation, wherein the annotated portion comprises at least two cells visible in the first view of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0037] – [0038], and elements 302 and 304 of figure 3. The operations further include creating a link to each cell in the annotated portion. *See Application* paragraph [0040] and element 306 of figure 3. The operations further include creating a record containing the annotation and the link to each cell in the annotated portion. *See Application* paragraphs [0032] – [0033] and element 150 of figure 2A. The operations further include displaying a second view of data. *See Application* paragraph [0042] and element 308 of figure 3. The operations further include analyzing the second view of data to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0042] – [0043], element 310 of figure 3, and elements 504 and 510 of figure 5. The operations further include providing an indication of the annotation, only if a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0044] – [0045], element 312 of figure 3, element 400 of Figures 4C and D, and element 514 of figure 5.

D. CLAIM 27 – INDEPENDENT

Claim 27 recites a system for creating and displaying annotations associated with views of data. As claimed, the system includes a processor. *See Application* Abstract, paragraphs [0023] and [0030], and element 110 of figure 1. The system further includes

an application for displaying views of data. *See Application* paragraphs [0026] and [0029], and elements 120 and 122 of figure 1. The system further includes a storage medium for storing an annotation database for storing annotation records. *See Application* paragraph [0031] and element 139 of figure 1. The system further includes an annotation system configured to allow a user to create an annotation for a selected annotated portion of a first view of data displayed by the application, wherein the annotated portion comprises at least two cells visible in the first view of data (*See Application* paragraphs [0037] – [0038], and elements 302 and 304 of figure 3), create cell links to each cell visible in the annotated portion (*See Application* paragraph [0040] and element 306 of figure 3), create an annotation record containing the annotation and the cell links (*See Application* paragraphs [0032] – [0033] and element 150 of figure 2A), analyze a second view of data displayed by the application to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data (*See Application* paragraphs [0042] – [0043], element 310 of figure 3, and elements 504 and 510 of figure 5), and provide an indication of the annotation, only if a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data (*See Application* paragraphs [0044] – [0045], element 312 of figure 3, element 400 of Figures 4C and D, and element 514 of figure 5).

Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

1. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.
2. Claims 9, 17, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.
3. Claims 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
4. Claims 9-10, 12-22 and 24, 26-27, 29-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Bays et al.* (US 2003/0018632 (hereinafter, "*Bays*")).

ARGUMENTS

Enablement of Claims 24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

The Applicable Law

The legal standard of the enablement requirement is "whether that disclosure, when filed, contained sufficient information regarding the subject matter of the claims as to enable one skilled in the pertinent art to make and use the claimed invention." MPEP § 2164.01.

The Examiner's Argument

The Examiner states, "Claim 24 rejected [sic] for not having support for 'tangible' medium. To amend the claim, the word 'tangible' should be deleted. To meet the requirement 'computer-readable storage medium' is enough." Page 4, lines 6-8, of Examiner's Final Office Action mailed September 12, 2006, hereinafter "Final Action."

Applicants' Response to the Examiner's Argument

Pursuant to the Examiner's suggestion, Applicants had requested an amendment of Claim 24 to delete "tangible" from the preamble. Pages 5 and 9 of Applicants' Response to Final Office Action Dated September 12, 2006, hereinafter "Response to Final Action." The Examiner, however, did not enter the amendment, contending that the amendment did not place the application in better form for appeal. Respectfully, the Examiner's position is untenable since, had the amendment been entered, the present rejection would have been removed, thereby placing the application in better form for appeal. Examiner's Advisory Action mailed November 24, 2006, hereinafter "Advisory Action." Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment should have been entered.

Moreover, Applicants believe that the enablement requirement of the first paragraph of § 112 is met, regardless of the adjective "tangible" in the preamble of Claim 24. One skilled in the art would surely be familiar with commonly used tangible computer-readable storage media, and numerous specific examples are provided by

Applicants' specification. For example, the current application refers to non-writable storage media (*e.g.*, read-only memory devices within a computer such as CD-ROM disks), and writable storage media (*e.g.*, floppy disks within a diskette drive or hard-disk drive). *See Application* paragraph [0023]. CD-ROM disks, floppy disks and read-only memory devices are all well known tangible storage media. Therefore, tangible media are both supported and enabled by Applicants' specification. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Indefiniteness of Claims 9, 17, 24 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The Applicable Law

The two primary purposes of the requirement of definiteness of claim language are (1) "...to ensure that the scope of the claims is clear so the public is informed of the boundaries of what constitutes infringement of the patent", and (2) "...to provide a clear measure of what Applicants regard as the invention." MPEP § 2173. In furtherance of this purpose, claim terms are to be understood according to the meaning given by the disclosures in the application. As noted in MPEP § 2173.01,

A fundamental principal contained in 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is that Applicants are their own lexicographers. They can define in the claims what they regard as their invention essentially in whatever terms they choose so long as any special meaning assigned to a term is clearly set forth in the specifications.

Therefore, rejections for indefiniteness under § 112, second paragraph, would be improperly applied to claim terms which have special meaning clearly set forth in the specifications.

The Examiner must state specific grounds for rejections under § 112. According to MPEP § 2173.02,

If upon review of a claim in its entirety, the examiner concludes that a rejection under § 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is appropriate, such a rejection should be made and an analysis as to why the phrase(s) used in the claim is "vague and indefinite" should be included in the Office Action.

Therefore, rejections for indefiniteness under § 112, second paragraph, would be improper if presented as a conclusion without explicit analysis.

The Examiner's Argument

The Examiner states, "Claims 9 and 17 recite 'second view of data' in the body of the claims. The claims do not show how this view is obtained or what is meant by second view." Final Action page 4, lines 17-18. Additionally, the Examiner states: "Claim 24 state 'for associating' in the preamble". The body of the claim never actually does the associating. There is no nexus between preamble and body of claim and it does not achieve [sic] the intended use of structuring data as recited in preamble." Final Action page 4, lines 20-22

The Examiner makes no mention as to the specific grounds for the rejection of Claim 27.

Applicants' Response to the Examiner's Argument

Respectfully, in regards to "second view of data," Applicants submit that the terms at issue are fully understandable according to their ordinary and customary meaning. A "view of data" is commonly understood as a visual representation of data. "First" and "second" merely designate different views separated by time ("first" occurs before "second").

Additionally, Applicants submit that any possible special meaning of "second view of data," and how such a view is obtained, is clearly set forth in the specifications. Paragraph [0007] functionally defines "a view" as desired data returned by a query in a concise format. Paragraph [0034] and Figure 2A describe how the linking component receives a set of cells visible in the annotated portion of the view 122A ("first view of data"). Paragraph [0035] and Figure 2B then describe the analysis of a subsequent view of data ("second view of data"), to determine whether to display an annotation from a previously generated view ("first view of data"). Paragraph [0042] makes the relationship explicit: "After an annotation has been attached to a first view of data via

operations 302-306, operations 308-312 may be performed to determine if the annotation should be displayed for a second (subsequent) view of data.”

Since “second view of data” can be understood both by ordinary and customary meaning and by the written description set for the application, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the Indefiniteness rejection of Claims 9 and 17.

Similarly, in regards to Claim 24, Applicants respectfully submit that support for the phrase “for associating” is clearly set forth in both the body of the claim and the specifications. In the body of the claim, an annotation is associated with an annotated portion in the operation of creating a record containing the annotation and the link to each cell in the annotated portion. The record thereby represents the association of the annotation to the annotated portion. The useful effects of this association are described in the specifications: “When an annotated cell, group of cells, or column is subsequently displayed (e.g., in a subsequent view), corresponding annotations may be retrieved based on the stored reference to the annotated data.” *Application* paragraph [0031]. “For some embodiments, the linking component 132 may also maintain a link table 152 that contains sufficient information to link visible cells of an annotated view or view row to corresponding annotations.” *Application* paragraph [0032]. Therefore, the body of the claim and the specifications clearly set forth support for the phrase “for associating.” Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner fails to state a specific reason for finding claim 27 to be indefinite. Lacking any specific grounds indicating otherwise, Applicants believe the claim to be definite, and respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims. [It is noted that the Examiner indicates that dependent Claim 31 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 of the base independent Claim 27. Final Action page 13, lines 2-4. Therefore, given the believed allowability of claim 27, dependent Claim 31 should consequently be allowable. Applicants respectfully request allowance of this claim.]

Non-statutory subject matter of Claims 17 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

The Applicable Law

A claim which produces a useful, tangible and concrete result will be held to cover statutory subject matter. As stated in MPEP § 2106.IV.C.(2).2.(b):

The tangible requirement does not necessarily mean that a claim must either be tied to a particular machine or apparatus or must operate to change articles or materials to a different state or thing. However, the tangible requirement does require that the claim must recite more than a 35 U.S.C. 101 judicial exception, in that the process claim must set forth a practical application of that judicial exception to produce a real-world result. Benson, 409 U.S. at 71-72, 175 USPQ at 676-77 (invention ineligible because had "no substantial practical application.").

Therefore, a claim which sets forth a practical application to produce a real-world result should be held to cover statutory subject matter.

The Examiner's Argument

The Examiner contends that Claims 17 and 24 list computational steps in a program without a tangible, useful, concrete result. Final Action page 5. The Examiner implies that providing an indication of the annotation only under certain conditions cannot be construed as a real world result because "There needs to be an outputting or storing for further use." *Id.*

Applicants' Response to the Examiner's Argument

Claims 17 and 24 do, in fact, produce a real-world result. The user is provided with valuable information concerning the cells visible in the second view of data. In particular, when the program provides an indication of the annotation, the user can conclude that a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are also visible in the referenced portion of the first view of data. The user can then choose to take subsequent action based on this knowledge. The indication of the annotation is only useful to the user at the time the second view of data is visible, and, consequently, outputting or storing the information would not enhance its usefulness. Applicants

therefore believe that the claims, as amended, are directed to statutory subject matter, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Anticipation of 9-10, 12-22 and 24, 26-27, 29-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by *Bays et al.*

The Applicable Law

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

The Reference

Bays is directed to methods for capturing annotations about database material which enable queries on both the database material and the annotations. Paragraph [0013]. When browsing database material, the user must select whether he wishes to view the annotations, without being given any indication if annotations for that material exist. Paragraphs [0086] – [0087] and Fig. 5, 260.

The Examiner's Argument

The Examiner contends that *Bays* teaches every element of independent Claims 9, 17, 24, and 27. In particular, the Examiner contends that *Bays* teaches analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data, citing Fig. 2 and paragraph [0038], lines 10 – 16. In reply to Applicants' previous assertion that *Bays* did not teach analyzing the second view of data, Examiner states:

As to the analysis of second view in regards to teachings of *Bays et al.* (US 2003/0018632 A1), since the second view has not been explained, the

examiner interprets Bays teaching on page 3 paragraph 0038 lines 10-16 as pertinent to the limitation. If annotations are retrieved, if they exist, then they can be filtered and or modified depending on the context of the reader.

Final Action, page 13, lines 15-19. The Examiner implies that the indefiniteness concern of the § 112 rejection leaves the “second view of data” unexplained.

Applicants’ Response to the Examiner’s Argument

In this case, *Bays* does not anticipate independent Claims 9, 17, 24, and 27 because *Bays* does not disclose “each and every element as set forth in the claim.” In particular, *Bays* does not disclose analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data, as recited in the claims.

As noted above, the Examiner’s rejection is premised on the presumed indefiniteness of a “second view of data.” However, as discussed above, the claims and specifications fully explain both the ordinary and customary meaning, and any special meanings, of “second view.” Based on the ordinary and customary meaning of “second view,” Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner’s rejection is obviated.

The Examiner incorrectly contends that *Bays* teaches analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data. The passage cited to support this contention states, “...when the annotations are retrieved, they can be filtered or modified in a way that depends on the context of the reader.” *Bays* paragraph [0038]. Note that *Bays* defines “context of the reader” as a group to which the author and reader belong, wherein a group is a related set of people, “such as people of a particular discipline or performing a particular role.” *Bays* paragraph [0017]. Examples of “context” are shown in *Bays* figure 2: “Team Lead” and “Reservoir Engr.” Therefore, *Bays* teaches that, when retrieved, annotations can be filtered or modified depending on the discipline or function of the reader. However, *Bays* neither discloses analyzing the second view of data in any form, nor any steps to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data. The Examiner has incorrectly

interpreted the teachings of *Bays* (and failed to properly appreciate the Applicants' claim limitations) to conclude that *Bays* anticipates the claims.

Because *Bays* fails to teach each and every element, Applicants submit claims 9, 17, 14, 27, and their dependents are allowable. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

1. The Examiner errs in finding that Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement.
2. The Examiner errs in finding that Claims 9, 17, 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.
3. The Examiner errs in finding that Claims 17 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
4. The Examiner errs in finding that Claims 9-10, 12-22 and 24, 26-27, 29-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Bays et al.* (US 2003/0018632 (hereinafter, "*Bays*")).

Respectfully submitted, and

/Gero G. McClellan, Reg. No. 44,227/

Gero G. McClellan
Registration No. 44,227
Patterson & Sheridan, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Appellant(s)

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1-8. (Canceled)

9. (Previously Presented) A computer implemented method for providing an indication of an annotation to a portion of a first view of data, comprising:
providing an interface allowing display of a second view of data;
analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data; and
providing an indication of the annotation in the interface, only if a predetermined set of sub-objects visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data.

10. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 9, wherein analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data comprises:
obtaining a set of sub-object links stored with the annotation; and
identifying sub-objects identified by the sub-object links that are visible in the second view of data.

11. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 10, wherein analyzing the second view of data to identify sub-objects visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data further comprises:
obtaining, based on sub-objects visible in the second view of data, an indication of the annotation from a table; and
wherein obtaining a set of sub-object links stored with the annotation comprises retrieving a record containing the annotation and the sub-object links using the indication of the annotation obtained from the table.

12. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 9, comprising providing an indication of the annotation in the interface only if each sub-object visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data is visible in the second view of data.

13. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 9, wherein providing an indication of the annotation in the interface comprises displaying an icon proximate one or more sub-objects visible in the second view of data that are also visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data.

14. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 13, wherein more than one annotation is associated with one or more portions of data in the second view and separate icons for each annotation are displayed.

15. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 13, wherein:
the method further comprises displaying the annotation in response to a user selecting the icon.

16. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 13, further comprising providing an indication of one or more sub-objects visible in the second view of data that are also visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data.

17. (Previously Presented) A computer implemented method of creating and displaying an annotation associated with an annotated portion of a first view of data, comprising:

providing an interface allowing selection of the annotated portion of the first view of data and creation of the annotation, wherein the annotated portion comprises at least two cells visible in the first view of data;

creating a record containing the annotation and a link to each cell in the annotated portion;

presenting a second view of data;

analyzing the second view of data to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data; and

providing an indication of the annotation, only if a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the referenced portion of the first view of data.

18. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the predetermined set of cells comprises at least one of:

- all the cells visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data;
- a predetermined number of cells visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data;
- a specified set of cells visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data; and
- a predetermined percentage of cells visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data.

19. (Original) The method of claim 18, wherein the predetermined set of cells is specified by a user via the interface allowing selection of the annotated portion of the first view of data and creation of the annotation.

20. (Original) The method of claim 18, further comprising providing a mechanism for identifying the predetermined set of cells, wherein the mechanism is accessible by a human user or a software application.

21. (Original) The method of claim 17, wherein the method further comprises creating an entry in a link table for each cell in the annotated portion, wherein the entry for each cell contains an indication of the annotations.

22. (Original) The method of claim 21, wherein the entry for each cell contains an identifier uniquely identifying the record containing the annotation.

23. (Original) The method of claim 21, wherein analyzing the second view of data to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data comprises:

- querying the link table to identify one or more annotations describing views of data containing cells in the second view of data;
- retrieving annotation records for the one or more identified annotations; and
- identifying cells visible in both the second view of data and views described by the identified annotations, based on cell links stored in the retrieved annotation records.

24. (Previously Presented) A tangible computer-readable storage medium containing a program for associating an annotation with an annotated portion of a first view of data which, when executed by a processor, performs operations comprising:
- providing an interface allowing a user to select the annotated portion and to create the annotation, wherein the annotated portion comprises at least two cells visible in the first view of data;
 - creating a link to each cell in the annotated portion;
 - creating a record containing the annotation and the link to each cell in the annotated portion;
 - displaying of a second view of data;
 - analyzing the second view of data to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data; and
 - providing an indication of the annotation, only if a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data.
25. (Canceled)
26. (Original) The computer-readable medium of claim 24, further comprising providing an interface allowing the user to specify the predetermined set of cells.
27. (Previously Presented) A system for creating and displaying annotations associated with views of data, comprising:
- a processor;
 - an application for displaying views of data;
 - a storage medium for storing an annotation database for storing annotation records; and
- an annotation system configured to allow a user to create and annotation for a selected annotated portion of a first view of data displayed by the application, wherein the annotated portion comprises at least two cells visible in the first view of data, create cell links to each cell visible in the annotated portion, create an annotation record containing the annotation and the cell links, analyze a second view of data displayed by

the application to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data, and provide an indication of the annotation, only if a predetermined set of cells visible in the second view of data are visible in the annotated portion of the first view of data.

28. (Canceled)

29. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 27, wherein the annotation system is further configured to allow a user to specify the predetermined set of cells.

30. (Previously Presented) The system of claim 27, wherein:
the system further comprises a link table; and
the annotation system is further configured to create an entry in a link table for each cell in the annotated portion of the first view of data, wherein the entry for each cell contains an identification of the annotation.

31. (Original) The system of claim 30, wherein the annotation system is configured to analyze the second view of data displayed by the application to identify cells visible in both the second view of data and the annotated portion of the first view of data by:

querying the link table to identify the annotation;

retrieving the annotation record containing the annotation and the query links;

and

identify, based on cell links contained in the annotation record, cells visible in the second view of data also visible in annotated portion of the first view of data.

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.